



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,821	03/31/2004	Yuichi Ichikawa	9683/184	5312

27879	7590	07/10/2007
INDIANAPOLIS OFFICE 27879		
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE		
ONE INDIANA SQUARE, SUITE 1600		
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-2033		

EXAMINER	
CAMPOS, YAIMA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2185	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/814,821

Applicant(s)

ICHIKAWA ET AL.

Examiner

Yaima Campos

Art Unit

2185

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11, 13-16 and 18-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-11, 13-16 and 18-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/6/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The instant application having Application No. 10/814,821 has a total of 26 claims pending in the application; there are 5 independent claims and 21 dependent claims, all of which are ready for examination by the examiner.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 16, 2007 has been entered.

SPECIFICATION

3. The amendments to the Specification filed on April 16, 2007 have been entered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF REFERENCES CITED BY APPLICANT

4. As required by **M.P.E.P. 609(C)**, the applicant's submissions of the Information Disclosure Statement dated February 6, 2007 is acknowledged by the examiner and the cited references have been considered in the examination of the claims now pending. As required by **M.P.E.P 609 C(2)**, a copy of the PTOL-1449 initialed and dated by the examiner is attached to the instant office action.

REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claim 6-7, 11 and 25-28** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443 in view of Suzuki (US 2004/0078636).

7. As per **claims 6 and 11**, (XP-002256443) discloses discloses a communication device comprising:

“operation input means for receiving a **request** command from a user **that requests transmission of contents;**” [“Applet caching ensures that applets are not unnecessarily downloaded by a browser every time a user references them” (XP-002256443)]

“cache memory means for temporarily storing data;” [“**browser cache**” (XP-002256443)]

“content storage means composed of nonvolatile memory; and” [“**secondary cache which browser cannot overwrite**” (XP-002256443)]

“a processor configured to receive contents;” [means for downloading (XP-002256443)]

“said processor operable, **in response to receipt of** said contents, to write said contents in said cache memory means;” [“**applet caching**” wherein “Java Plug-in has supported caching in

Art Unit: 2185

previous versions by using the same cache the browser uses for all other web documents.

This works for casual applet usage, but larger applets can often get flushed from the cache to make room for other documents since the browser has no knowledge that an applet file might be needed in the future. The result is that this caching strategy fails where is needed most in large business applets” (XP-002256443)]

“said processor further operable, after said contents are stored in said cache memory means, to process or execute said contents automatically, absent receipt of any command initiated by a user” [“**Browser: Run applets from the browser cache (default)**” (XP-002256443)]

“and said processor further operable, in accordance with storage control information associated with said contents, and responsive to a store command received from said user via said operation input means, to read said contents from said cache memory means, and to write said contents in said content storage means” [“**This release introduces an alternative form of applet caching which allows an applet deployer to decide her applet should be “sticky”, that is, to stay on the disk in a secondary cache which the browser cannot overwrite” wherein “This new feature is activated by including the new PARAM... EMBED/OBJECT tag”** (XP-002256443)].

To further detail (XP-002256443), Suzuki discloses operation input means for receiving a request command from a user that requests transmission of contents [input and output means for computer system storage and software execution method using the same... when providing new software for trial” (Suzaki, Par. 0002) “Trial software and trial data are exchanged via various communication media... trial software and trial data distributed via the Internet in particular” (Par. 0004)]

Art Unit: 2185

“cache memory means for temporarily storing data;” [This limitation is disclosed by Suzuki as “disk cache 78 provided in RAM” (Par. 0038)]

“content storage means composed of nonvolatile memory; and” [With respect to this limitation, Suzuki discloses “HDD 74” (Par. 0038)]

“a processor configured to receive contents;” “trial software and trial data are exchanged via various communication media” (Par. 0002) and “MPU 72” (Figure 6)]

“said processor operable, in response to receipt of said contents, to write said contents in said cache memory means;” [“A disk cache is a memory (usually a semiconductor memory) that is faster than the hard disk, that is used to hold data to enable hard disk data to be rewritten at high speed, for effecting high-speed access in cases where the same data is accessed a number of times, and for collectively writing to disk with an intentional delay” (Par. 0034)]

and said processor further operable, in accordance with storage control information associated with said contents, and responsive to a store command..., to read said contents from said cache memory means, and to write said contents in said content storage means [Suzuki discloses this limitation as “MPU 72;” “when data is recorded on HDD 74 in accordance with a request from OS kernel 71 or the like, using the write-back method, data in a disk cache 78 provided in RAM is recorded via MPU 72” and explains that “a switch 73 is provided between MPU 72 and the HDD 74 that controls whether or not data flows there between” (Pars. 0034 and 0038) wherein “the MPU 72 and write-back switch 73 are controlled by OS kernel 75. The OS kernel 75 operates in accordance with requests from program 77 and trial settings 76” (Par. 0038) “when it is known that the data recorded on

the CD-ROM is safe, the path via which data is transferred from the disk cache of the computer system 11 to the HDD is established and operations performed using the HDD” (Par. 0031)].

“Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443 and Suzaki (US 2004/0078636) are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computer memory access and control.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the applet caching system which runs applets in a cache browser and allows an applet deployer/user to decide her applet should be “sticky”, that is, to stay on the disk in a secondary cache which the browser cannot overwrite (XP-002256443) with the system which enables trial software, trial data and mail data to be safely tried wherein writes to a hard disk, in the virtual computer system are made via a disk cache, and whether or not data is transferred from the disk cache to the hard disk is controlled as taught by Suzaki.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Suzaki discloses [**“the trial user can try out the distributed application without being subject to non-recoverable damage from computer viruses” (Par. 0117)]**].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine “Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443 with Suzaki (US 2004/0078636) for the benefit of creating a communication device to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6 and 11.

8. As per claim 7, the combination of XP-002256443 and Suzaki (US 2004/0078636) discloses A communication device according to Claim 6, [See rejection to claim 6 above]

Art Unit: 2185

wherein: "said processor is further operable to receive said storage control information indicative that said contents are for trial use; and said processor, in response to receipt of said storage control information, is further operable to write said contents in only said cache memory means" [Suzaki discloses as writes of trial data to a hard disk are made through a disk cache (Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0034-0038) wherein "it is possible to obtain some findings with respect to whether or not trial software, trial data or mail data is safe" (Par. 0035) wherein "when it is known that the data recorded on the CD-ROM is safe, the path via which data is transferred from the disk cache of the computer system 11 to the HDD is established and operations performed using the HDD" (Par. 0031) "data transfer path from the disk cache to the hard disk is provided with a switch to control the flow of data, controlling whether of not there are hard-disk drives" (Par. 0034) (See FIGS. 6 and 7)].

9. As per claims 25-26 (new), the combination of XP-002256443 and Suzaki discloses A communication device according to claim 6, wherein said processor is further operable to deny said contents from being written in said content storage means in response to indication with said storage control information that said contents are for trial use; wherein said processor is further operable to write said contents into said content storage means in response to indication with said storage control information that said contents can be stored in said communication device [Suzaki discloses "enabling distribution of copies of applications that are running makes it possible to distribute trial evaluation versions... the trial user can try out the distributed application without being subject to non-recoverable damage from computer viruses" (Par. 0117) "when it is known that the data recorded on the CD-ROM is safe, that path via which data is transferred from the disk cache of the computer system 11 to the HDD is

established and operations performed using the HDD” (Pa. 0031) “write-backs are not performed when an application program or the like is being tried out” (Par. 0111)].

10. As per **claim 27** (new), the combination of XP-002256443 and Suzuki discloses The program of claim 11, wherein said content using process is operable to process or execute said contents automatically on a trial basis [**XP-002256443 discloses “run applets from the browser cache (default).” And Suzuki discloses “generally, to prevent such damage, trial software is tried out” (Par. 0004)].**

11. As per **claim 28** (new), the combination of XP-002256443 and Suzuki discloses The program of Claim 11, wherein said content using process is operable to delete the contents stored in said cache memory means, and said second writing process is not executable, in response to indication with said storage control information that said contents are for trial use only [**With respect to this limitation, Suzuki discloses “Trial software and trial data are exchanged via various communication media, and there are cases in which computer systems are damaged by computer viruses that become attached accompanying trial software and trial data distributed via the Internet in particular... to prevent such damage, trial software is tried out, or characteristics of files created by a virus produced by reading trial data or mail data are detected and the file removed, or files that have a computer virus are erased before trying out trial software or reading trial data or mail data” (Par. 0005) “a first storage, a second storage that with respect to access speed operates at a higher speed than the first storage, and a processor; and a virtual computer operating on the computer and equipped with a configuration that, when writing to the first storage, writes via a disk**

cache of a predetermined capacity, and a switch that controls whether or not data is transferred from the disk cache to the first storage” (Par. 0016)].

12. Claim 13-15, 19-24, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443 in view of Suzuki (US 2004/0078636) and Liebrand (US 2005/0044177).

13. As per claims 13-15, (XP-002256443) discloses A communication device comprising: “operation input means, for receiving a first command from a user;” [**“Applet caching ensures that applets are not unnecessarily downloaded by a browser every time a user references them”** (XP-002256443)]

“content storage means for storing contents;” [**“browser cache” and “secondary cache which browser cannot overwrite”** (XP-002256443)]

a processor operable to receive contents; [**means for downloading** (XP-002256443)]

“after said contents are received, said processor further operable to write said contents in said content storage means in association with a first identifier indicating that said contents are to be stored temporarily in said content storage means;” [**“applet caching” wherein “Java Plug-in has supported caching in previous versions by using the same cache the browser uses for all other web documents. This works for casual applet usage, but larger applets can often get flushed from the cache to make room for other documents since the browser has no knowledge that an applet file might be needed in the future. The result is that this caching strategy fails where is needed most in large business applets”** (XP-002256443)]

in response to said contents being written in said content storage means, “said processor further operable, after said contents are stored in said cache memory means, to process or execute said

Art Unit: 2185

contents automatically, absent receipt of any command initiated by a user” [**“Browser: Run applets from the browser cache (default)” (XP-002256443)**]

“and said processor responsive to a second command received via said operation input means to store contents processed or executed by said processor, said processor further operable in in accordance with storage control information, and in response to said second command, to exchange said first identifier flag for a second identifier flag that indicates said contents are to be stored in said content storage means enduringly” [**“This release introduces an alternative form of applet caching which allows an applet deployer to decide her applet should be “sticky”, that is, to stay on the disk in a secondary cache which the browser cannot overwrite” wherein “This new feature is activated by including the new PARAM... EMBED/OBJECT tag” (XP-002256443).**]

(XP-002256443) does not disclose expressly that the identifier used to indicate whether contents are to be stored temporarily or enduringly is a flag nor having trial contents stored in cache and storing contents to disk when said contents are not for trial use.

Suzaki discloses “operation input means, for receiving a first command from a user;” [**input and output means for computer system storage and software execution method using the same... when providing new software for trial” (Suzaki, Par. 0002) “Trial software and trial data are exchanged via various communication media... trial software and trial data distributed via the Internet in particular” (Par. 0004)**]

“content storage means for storing contents;” [**With respect to this limitation, Suzaki discloses “disk cache 78 provided in RAM” (Par. 0038) and “HDD 74” (Column 3, paragraph 0038, line 1)**]

Art Unit: 2185

a processor operable to receive contents; [With respect to this limitation, Suzuki discloses that “trial software and trial data are exchanged via various communication media” (Column 1, paragraph 002) and “MPU 72” (Figure 6)]

“after said contents are received, said processor further operable to write said contents in said content storage means in association with a first identifier indicating that said contents are to be stored temporarily in said content storage means,” [Suzaki discloses this limitation as “A disk cache is a memory (usually a semiconductor memory) that is faster than the hard disk, that is used to hold data to enable hard disk data to be rewritten at high speed, for effecting high-speed access in cases where the same data is accessed a number of times, and for collectively writing to disk with an intentional delay” (Column 2, paragraph 0034)] [Suzaki discloses this limitation as “MPU 72,” “when data is recorded on HDD 74 in accordance with a request from OS kernel 71 or the like, using the write-back method, data in a disk cache 78 provided in RAM is recorded via MPU 72” and explains that “a switch 73 is provided between MPU 72 and the HDD 74 that controls whether or not data flows there between” (Columns 2-3, paragraphs 0034 and 0038) wherein “the MPU 72 and write-back switch 73 are controlled by OS kernel 75. The OS kernel 75 operates in accordance with requests from program 77 and trial settings 76” (Page 3, Paragraph 0038)]

“and said processor responsive to a second command received via said operation input means to store contents processed or executed by said processor, said processor further operable in in accordance with storage control information, and in response to said second command, to exchange said first identifier flag for a second identifier flag that indicates said contents are to be stored in said content storage means enduringly” [Suzaki discloses this concept as “a

software execution method” that by “using the input and output means for computer system storage, enables trial software, trial data and mail data to be safely tried” (Column 1, paragraph 0015, lines 10-14) wherein “when writing to a first storage, writes via a disk cache of a predetermined capacity” and later performs write-back of data to “HDD 74” (Column 1, paragraph 0016 and Columns 2-3, paragraphs 00034 and 00038) wherein “when data is recorded on HDD 74 in accordance with a request from OS kernel 71 or the like, using the write-back method, data in a disk cache 78 provided in RAM is recorded via MPU 72” and explains that “a switch 73 is provided between MPU 72 and the HDD 74 that controls whether or not data flows there between” (Columns 2-3, paragraphs 00034 and 00038) wherein “the MPU 72 and write-back switch 73 are controlled by OS kernel 75. The OS kernel 75 operates in accordance with requests from program 77 and trial settings 76” (Page 3, Paragraph 00038)].

“said processor is further operable, only in response to determination by the processor that the content is not for trial use, to store the content in the second storage area, and await receipt initiated by the user to process or execute the longer term stored content” [Suzaki discloses as writes of trial data to a hard disk are made through a disk cache (Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 00034-00038) wherein “it is possible to obtain some findings with respect to whether or not trial software, trial data or mail data is safe” (Par. 00035) wherein “when it is known that the data recorded on the CD-ROM is safe, the path via which data is transferred from the disk cache of the computer system 11 to the HDD is established and operations performed using the HDD” (Par. 00031) “data transfer path from the disk cache to the hard disk is

provided with a switch to control the flow of data, controlling whether or not there are hard-disk drives” (Par. 0034) (See FIGS. 6 and 7)].

Liebrand explicitly discloses an identifier flag to indicate contents are to be stored temporarily or enduringly in a communication device in a wireless network as [“**a mobile web browsing device able to download and store content from a web server over a wireless network, wherein the device is programmed to: (a) recognize a usage definition applied to certain downloadable content, in which the definition prohibits discarding that content from a memory in the device; (b) apply a flag to that content and store that content in combination with the flag in the device memory;” (Par.s 0004-0007) “the content and accompanying definitions are then sent to the device over the cellular network controlled by a network operator... the flag defines how the device uses the content-in particular, defining that the device will not discard that content from memory” (Par. 0008)].**

“Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443, Suzuki (US 2004/0078636) and Liebrand are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computer memory access and control.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the applet caching system which runs applets in a cache browser and allows an applet deployer/user to decide her applet should be “sticky”, that is, to stay on the disk in a secondary cache which the browser cannot overwrite (XP-002256443) with the system which enables trial software, trial data and mail data to be safely tried wherein writes to a hard disk, in the virtual computer system are made via a disk cache, and whether or not data is transferred from the disk cache to the hard disk is controlled as taught by Suzuki and further exchanging a

Art Unit: 2185

first identifier flag that indicates contents are to be stored temporarily for a second identifier flag that indicates contents are to be stored enduringly as taught by Liebrand.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Suzuki discloses [**“the trial user can try out the distributed application without being subject to non-recoverable damage from computer viruses” (Par. 0117)**]. Liebrand discloses [**“flagged home pages stored on device memory are persistent since they are not routinely discarded from memory... hence, they can reliably be viewed even when the device is out of cellular coverage and the device has freed up disk space” (Par. 0008)**].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine “Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443 with Suzuki (US 2004/0078636) and Liebrand (US 2005/0044177) for the benefit of creating a communication device to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13-15.

14. As per **claim 19**, the combination of XP-002256443, Suzuki and Liebrand discloses the communication device of Claim 15, [See rejection to claim 15 above] “wherein the first storage area and the second storage area are assigned areas of the memory” [Refer to “RAM 71” and “HDD 74” (Fig. 6) of Suzuki. XP-002256443 discloses browser cache and secondary cache which the browser cannot overwrite].

15. As per **claim 20**, the combination of XP-002256443, Suzuki and Liebrand discloses the communication device of Claim 15, wherein “the first storage area and the second storage area are identified with a respective **predetermined** indicator **flag** included in the data stored in the respective first and second storage areas” [With respect to this limitation, Suzuki discloses “when writing to a first storage, writes via a disk cache of a predetermined capacity” and

Art Unit: 2185

later performs write-back of data to “HDD 74” (Column 1, paragraph 0016 and Columns 2-3, paragraphs 0034 and 0038) wherein “when data is recorded on HDD 74 in accordance with a request from OS kernel 71 or the like, using the write-back method, data in a disk cache 78 provided in RAM is recorded via MPU 72” and explains that “a switch 73 is provided between MPU 72 and the HDD 74 that controls whether or not data flows there between” (Columns 2-3, paragraphs 0034 and 0038) wherein “the MPU 72 and write-back switch 73 are controlled by OS kernel 75. The OS kernel 75 operates in accordance with requests from program 77 and trial settings 76” (Page 3, Paragraph 0038). Liebrand explicitly discloses an identifier flag to indicate contents are to be stored temporarily or enduringly in a communication device in a wireless network (Pars. 0004-0008)].

16. As per claim 21, the combination of XP-002256443, Suzaki and Liebrand discloses the communication device of Claim 15, [See rejection to claim 15 above] wherein “the processor is operable to automatically process or execute the temporarily stored content to enable a user to demo the temporarily stored content” [The rationale of the rejection of claims 13-15 is herein incorporated].

17. As per claim 22, the combination of XP-002256443, Suzaki and Liebrand discloses the communication device of Claim 21, wherein “the processor is operable to change a status of the temporarily stored content to long term stored content in response to receipt of a user command to perform such a change” [With respect to this limitation, Suzaki discloses “when writing to a first storage, writes via a disk cache of a predetermined capacity” and later performs write-back of data to “HDD 74” (Column 1, paragraph 0016 and Columns 2-3, paragraphs 0034 and 0038) wherein “when data is recorded on HDD 74 in accordance with a request

from OS kernel 71 or the like, using the write-back method, data in a disk cache 78 provided in RAM is recorded via MPU 72” and explains that “a switch 73 is provided between MPU 72 and the HDD 74 that controls whether or not data flows there between” (Columns 2-3, paragraphs 0034 and 0038) wherein “the MPU 72 and write-back switch 73 are controlled by OS kernel 75. The OS kernel 75 operates in accordance with requests from program 77 and trial settings 76” (Page 3, Paragraph 0038). XP-002256443 discloses “applet caching which allows and applet deployer to decide her applet should be stick, that is, to stay on the disk in a secondary cache which the browser cannot overwrite”].

18. As per claim 23, the combination of XP-002256443, Suzuki and Liebrand discloses the communication device of Claim 22, wherein “the processor is operable to change the status by relocation of, the content from the first storage area to the second storage area” [With respect to this limitation, Suzuki discloses “when writing to a first storage, writes via a disk cache of a predetermined capacity” and later performs write-back of data to “HDD 74” (Column 1, paragraph 0016 and Columns 2-3, paragraphs 00034 and 0038) wherein “when data is recorded on HDD 74 in accordance with a request from OS kernel 71 or the like, using the write-back method, data in a disk cache 78 provided in RAM is recorded via MPU 72” and explains that “a switch 73 is provided between MPU 72 and the HDD 74 that controls whether or not data flows there between” (Columns 2-3, paragraphs 0034 and 0038) wherein “the MPU 72 and write-back switch 73 are controlled by OS kernel 75. The OS kernel 75 operates in accordance with requests from program 77 and trial settings 76” (Page 3, Paragraph 0038)].].

Art Unit: 2185

19. As per claim 24, the combination of XP-002256443, Suzaki and Liebrand discloses The communication device of Claim 22, wherein “the processor is operable to change the status by modification of predetermined indicator included in the content, wherein the predetermined indicator is modified to indicate that the content is stored longer term instead of temporarily”

[With respect to this limitation, Suzaki discloses “when writing to a first storage, writes via a disk cache of a predetermined capacity” and later performs write-back of data to “HDD 74” (Column 1, paragraph 0016 and Columns 2-3, paragraphs 00034 and 00038) wherein “when data is recorded on HDD 74 in accordance with a request from OS kernel 71 or the like, using the write-back method, data in a disk cache 78 provided in RAM is recorded via MPU 72” and explains that “a switch 73 is provided between MPU 72 and the HDD 74 that controls whether or not data flows there between” (Columns 2-3, paragraphs 00034 and 00038) wherein “the MPU 72 and write-back switch 73 are controlled by OS kernel 75. The OS kernel 75 operates in accordance with requests from program 77 and trial settings 76” (Page 3, Paragraph 00038). Liebrand explicitly discloses an identifier flag included in the content to indicates contents are to be stored temporarily or enduringly in a communication device in a wireless network (Pars. 0004-0008)].

20. As per claims 30-31, the combination of XP-002256443, Suzaki and Liebrand discloses The communication device of claim 13, wherein said storage control information is included with said contents received by said processor [Liebrand discloses “apply a flag to that content and store that content in combination with the flag in the device memory” (Par. 00063)]

Art Unit: 2185

wherein said storage control information comprises a predetermined indication of whether the contents can be stored temporarily or enduringly in said content storage means [See Liebrand (Pars. 0004-0008)].

21. As per claim 32, the combination of XP-002256443, Suzaki and Liebrand discloses The communication device of claim 13, wherein said processor further operable to exchange said first identifier flag for said second identifier flag comprises said processor being operable to modify a first predetermined value representative of said first identifier flag to a second predetermined value representative of said second identifier flag [The rationale in the rejection to claims 13-15 is herein incorporated].

22. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443 in view of Suzaki (US 2004/0078636) as applied to claims 6-7 above, and further in view of Wong et al. (US 2004/0111443).

23. As per claim 8, Suzaki discloses a communication device according to Claim 6, [See rejection to claim 6 above] but does not disclose expressly “said processor is further operable to determine whether a size of a free space of said content storage means is equal to, or greater than, a data size of said contents stored in said cache memory means; and in response to said size of said free space of said content storage means is equal to, or greater than, said data size of said contents stored in said cache memory means, said processor farther operable to write said contents processed or executed by said processor in said content storage means after reading said contents from said cache memory means.”

Wong discloses the concept of “said processor is further operable to determine whether a size of a free space of said content storage means is equal to, or greater than, a data size of said contents stored in said cache memory means; and when said size of said free space of said content storage means is equal to, or greater than, said data size of said contents stored in said cache memory means, said processor farther operable to write said contents processed or executed by said processor in said content storage means after reading said contents from said cache memory means” as **[a process for writing an object to main memory by a cache controller wherein “cache controller 44 first determines whether the object to be written can fit in the buffer 62” (Columns 5-6, paragraph 0060)] “if the object fits in the object buffer 62, the object is written to object buffer 62” (Columns 5-6, paragraph 0060)]**.

“Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443, Suzuki (US 2004/0078636) and Wong et al. (US 2004/0111443) are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computer memory management.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the content trial system which first stores contents in a cache and then transfers these contents to a content storage as described by (XP-002256443) and Suzuki and determine if there is enough space in a content storage before transferring data to this content storage as taught by Wong.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Wong teaches that determining whether there is enough free space in memory before transferring data **[“increases caching performance of persistent memory” (Column 1, paragraph 0003) and prevents system**

Art Unit: 2185

crashes as when there is not enough space in memory, the system prevents writing new objects to memory].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wong et al. (US 2004/0111443) with “Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443 and Suzuki (US 2004/0078636) for the benefit of creating a content trial system to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

24. **Claims 9-10** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443, Suzuki (US 2004/0078636) in view of Wong et al. (US 2004/0111443) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Spencer et al. (US 2003/0014496).

25. As per **claims 9 and 10** A communication device according to Claim 8, wherein:

“in response to said size of said free space of said content storage means **being** smaller than said data size of said contents stored in said cache memory means, said processor is further operable to” delete data as **“cache controller 44 purges entries from persistent memory 50 that are older than a particular age, and moves entries buffered in main memory 48 having dates greater than a particular age to persistent memory 50”** and explains that **“purging entries from persistent memory 50 frees up disk space, and moving entries from main memory 48 frees up buffer space”** (Column 5, paragraph 0059)] but does not disclose expressly “prompt a user to delete one or more other contents stored in said content storage means; and when, in response to said prompt, a command is received via said operation input means to delete said one or more other contents stored in said content storage means, said processor is further operable to determine if, after deletion of said one or more other contents, said free space of said content

Art Unit: 2185

storage means will be equal to, or greater than, said data size of said contents, said processor further operable to provide indication thereof to a user.”

Spencer discloses the concept of “prompt a user to delete one or more other contents stored in said content storage means; and when, in response to said prompt, a command is received via said operation input means to delete said one or more other contents stored in said content storage means, said processor is further operable to determine if, after deletion of said one or more other contents, said free space of said content storage means will be equal to, or greater than, said data size of said contents, said processor further operable to provide indication thereof to a user.” (*Pages 9-10, paragraph 0048 of Applicant’s specification identifies this means as “CPU 400” as [a device which downloads files through a computer network (Column 3, paragraph 0027) wherein “download manager 120;” (Figure 1) completes “the instructions for remote management can include instructions to add specific media content to existing media content on the digital playback device, or instructions to remove specific media content from the digital media playback device. The instructions to remove specific media content can be generated in response to a request from a user or be automatically generated” (Column 2, paragraph 0015) and provides an example in which when there is not enough space to download a file, the user is asked to delete one or more files residing on the device and the user is able to submit a command to delete selected files (Columns 10-11, paragraph 0084)].*

Suzaki (US 2004/0078636), “Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443, Wong et al. (US 2004/0111443) and Spencer et al. (US

2003/0014496) are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computer memory management.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the content trial system which first stores contents in a cache and then transfers these contents to a content storage as described by Suzaki and Pawate and determine if there is enough space in a content storage before transferring data to this content storage as taught by Wong, and further prompt a user to delete contents of a storage device when there is not enough space to store new data as taught by Spencer.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Spencer teaches that a user prompted to delete contents of a storage device when there is not enough space to store new data **[in order to free space when new files must be downloaded to a storage device (Columns 10-11, paragraph 0084)]**.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Spencer et al. (US 2003/0014496), "Applet Caching in Java Plug-in" JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443, Suzaki (US 2004/0078636) and Wong et al. (US 2004/0111443) for the benefit of creating a content trial system to obtain the invention as specified in claims 9-10.

26. **Claims 16, 18 and 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Applet Caching in Java Plug-in" JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443, Suzaki (US 2004/0078636), Liebrand (US 2005/0044177) in view of Wong et al. (US 2004/0111443) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Spencer et al. (US 2003/0014496).

27. As per **claim 16**, the communication device of Claim 15, **[See rejection to claim 15 above]** wherein "the processor is operable to exit and automatically delete the temporarily stored

Art Unit: 2185

content in response to receipt of a user command to cease execution or processing of the temporarily stored content” [The rationale in the rejection of claim 9 is herein incorporated].

28. As per claim 18, the communication device of Claim 15, [See rejection to claim 15 above] wherein “the first storage area is a cache area of the memory, and the processor is further operable to delete data from the second storage area only in response to receipt of a user command to delete from the second storage area” [The rationale in the rejection to claim 9 is herein incorporated].

29. As per claim 33, the combination of Suzuki, (XP-002256443), Liebrand and Spencer discloses The communication device of claim 16, wherein the processor, prior to exit and automatic deletion of the temporarily stored content, is further operable to prompt the user to store the content in the second storage area only in response to an indication that the content is not for trial use [Suzuki discloses as writes of trial data to a hard disk are made through a disk cache (Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0034-0038) wherein “it is possible to obtain some findings with respect to whether or not trial software, trial data or mail data is safe” (Par. 0035) wherein “when it is known that the data recorded on the CD-ROM is safe, the path via which data is transferred from the disk cache of the computer system 11 to the HDD is established and operations performed using the HDD” (Par. 0031) “data transfer path from the disk cache to the hard disk is provided with a switch to control the flow of data, controlling whether of not there are hard-disk drives” (Par. 0034) (See FIGS. 6 and 7)].

30. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443 in view of Suzuki (US

2004/0078636) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Yamada et al. (US 2003/0037105).

31. As per claim 29, the combination of XP-002256443 and Suzuki discloses The program of Claim 11, but does not disclose expressly wherein said receiving process is operable to receive an application description file as part of said contents, and said program further comprising a requesting process that is executable to extract an application location identifier from said application description file, and transmit a request for an application that is part of said contents, said application received with said receiving process.

Yamada discloses receiving process is operable to receive an application description file as part of said contents, and said program further comprising a requesting process that is executable to extract an application location identifier from said application description file, and transmit a request for an application that is part of said contents, said application received with said receiving process as [**“when storing the received application (a), CPU 11 reads out a storage location of ADF stored in RAM 13 and correlates with the Jar... CPU 11 stores the storage location information of application (a) (that is, storage location of ADF and Jar corresponding to application (a)” (Pars. 0079-0080) wherein “CPU 11 reads out the application (a) that the user designated (when application (a) is a Java application, ADF or JAR) according to the storage location information “EEPROM (#1)”” (Par. 0099)]**].

“Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443, Suzuki (US 2004/0078636 and Yamada et al. (US 2003/0037105) are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of computer memory access and control.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the content trial system which first stores contents in a cache and then transfers these contents to a content storage as described by (XP-002256443) and Suzuki and further have receiving process is operable to receive an application description file as part of said contents, and said program further comprising a requesting process that is executable to extract an application location identifier from said application description file, and transmit a request for an application that is part of said contents, said application received with said receiving process as taught by Yamada.

The motivation for doing so would have been because Yamada discloses [**“a Java application is divided into ADF having attributes such as a name of the application, and Jar containing a data body of the application; and ADF and Jar are held in IP server W. In the following explanation, unless there is a specific need to distinguish ADF from Jar, they will each be referred to as a Java application. Applications other than Java applications are stored without being divided (Par. 0038)”.]**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine “Applet Caching in Java Plug-in” JAVA.SUN.COM, August (2000-08), XP-002256443, Suzuki (US 2004/0078636 and Yamada et al. (US 2003/0037105) for the benefit of creating a communication device to obtain the invention as specified in claim 29.

Art Unit: 2185

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ISSUES RAISED BY THE APPLICANT

Response to Amendment

32. Applicant's arguments filed April 16, 2007 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

33. As required by M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f), a response to these arguments appears below.

ARGUMENTS CONCERNING PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

34. Claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation during examination and limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim (See M.P.E.P. 2111 [R-1]).

35. Regarding Applicant's remarks that Suzaki does not disclose that a processor received trial information to indicate contents are for trial; it is the Examiner's position that Suzaki discloses this limitation as **[if it is assumed that all software is for trial; then as the processor receives data it must immediately recognize this data is for trial use; therefore, the data itself comprises information indicating contents are for trial]**. Furthermore, Suzaki explicitly discloses **["it is possible to obtain some findings with respect to whether or not trial software, trial data or mail data is safe"** (Page 3, Par. 0035); **therefore this trial software, trial data and mail data inherently includes information indicating it is for trial]**.

36. All arguments by the applicant are believed to be covered in the body of the office action or in the above remarks and thus, this action constitutes a complete response to the issues raised in the remarks dated April 16, 2007.

CLOSING COMMENTS

Examiner's Note

37. Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

a. STATUS OF CLAIMS IN THE APPLICATION

38. The following is a summary of the treatment and status of all claims in the application as recommended by M.P.E.P. 707.07(i):

a(1) CLAIMS REJECTED IN THE APPLICATION

39. Per the instant office action, claims 6-11, 13-16 and 18-33 have received a first action on the merits and are subject of a first action non-final.

a(2) CLAIMS NO LONGER UNDER CONSIDERATION

40. Claims 1-5, 12 and 17 have been canceled as of the amendment filed on April 16, 1007.

b. DIRECTION OF FUTURE CORRESPONDENCES

41. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yaima Campos whose telephone number is (571) 272-1232. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.


IMPORTANT NOTE

42. If attempts to reach the above noted Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Mr. Sanjiv Shah, can be reached at the following telephone number: Area Code (571) 272-4098.

43. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 22, 2007


SANJIV SHAH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100


Yaima Campos
Examiner
Art Unit 2185